



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/800,796

03/15/2004

Mark G. O'Donnell

ODONNELL.7374

9194

55740 7590 06/12/2009

GAUTHIER & CONNORS, LLP
225 FRANKLIN STREET
SUITE 2300
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

BRINSON, PATRICK F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3754

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/12/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10800796	3/15/04	O'DONNELL ET AL.	ODONNELL.7374

GAUTHIER & CONNORS, LLP
225 FRANKLIN STREET
SUITE 2300
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

Patrick F.. Brinson

ART UNIT	PAPER
3754	20090609

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

This communication is in response to the Board of Appeals' request for a proper explanation of the grounds of rejection on appeal and to include missing references under the Evidence Relied Upon section of the Examiner's Answer.

The Appellant's statement of grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is incorrect because it is inconsistent with the status of claims section and the arguments presented in the brief. The correct grounds of rejection are as follows:

Claims 37, 38, 40-43, 46 and 50-53 are rejected 35 U.S.C. (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 1,435,311 to Knight.
Claims 44 and 45 are rejected 35 U.S.C. (a) as being unpatentable over Knight in view of U.S. 4,929,478 to Conaghan et al.
Claim 39 is rejected 35 U.S.C. (a) as being unpatentable over Knight in view of U.S. 4,181,157 to DeCamp.
Claims 47-49 are rejected 35 U.S.C. (a) as being unpatentable over Knight in view of U.S. 3,762,982 to Whittington.

The evidence relied upon in the Examiner's Answer is provided below:

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

U.S. 1,435,311	Knight	11-1922
U.S. 4,929,478	Conaghan et al.	5-1990
U.S. 4,181,157	DeCamp	1-1980
U.S. 3,762,982	Whittington	10-1973

/Patrick F. Brinson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3754